arXiv:1605.00641v1 [math.LO] 2 May 2016

# THE ISOMETRY DEGREE OF A COMPUTABLE COPY OF $\ell^p$

TIMOTHY H. MCNICHOLL AND D. M. STULL

Abstract. When $p$ is a computable real so that $p \geq 1$, the isometry degree of a computable copy $\mathcal{B}$ of $\ell^p$ is defined to be the least powerful Turing degree that computes a linear isometry of $\ell^p$ onto $\mathcal{B}$. We show that this degree always exists and that when $p \neq 2$ these degrees are precisely the c.e. degrees.

## 1. Introduction

Complexity of isomorphisms is a recurring theme of computable structure theory. For example, a computable structure is *computably categorical* if there is a computable isomorphism between any two of its computable copies; it is $\Delta^0_n$-*categorical* if there is a $\Delta^0_n$ isomorphism between any two of its computable copies. The *degree of categoricity* of a computable structure is the least powerful oracle that computes an isomorphism between any two of its computable copies [5]. There is at this time no characterization of the degrees of categoricity. Partial results can be found in [1], [4],[5].

Throughout most of its development, computable structure theory has focused on countable structures. However, there has recently emerged a program to apply the concepts of computable structure theory to the sort of uncountable structures commonly encountered in analysis such as metric spaces and Banach spaces. For example, A.G. Melnikov has shown $C[0,1]$ is not computably categorical as a metric space [9], and Melnikov and Ng have shown that $C[0,1]$ is not computably categorical as a Banach space [10]. In their seminal text, Pour-El and Richards showed that $\ell^1$ is not computably categorical but that $\ell^2$ is (though the results were not framed in the language of computable categoricity). In 2013 Melnikov asked if $\ell^p$ is computably categorical for any values of $p$ besides 2 [9]. In 2015 McNicholl answered this question in the negative and later showed that $\ell^p$ is $\Delta^0_2$-categorical whenever $p$ is a computable real so that $p \geq 1$ [7], [8].

Here we put forward the study of a new notion: the *degree of isomorphism* for a pair of isomorphic computable structures $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$; this is defined to be the least powerful oracle that computes an isomorphism of $\mathcal{A}$ onto $\mathcal{B}$. If among all computable copies of $\mathcal{A}$ one, say $\mathcal{A}_0$, is regarded as standard, then we define the isomorphism degree of a single computable copy of $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$, to be the isomorphism degree of $(\mathcal{A}_0, \mathcal{B})$. This notion fits in with the general theme of studying complexity of isomorphisms and is a local version of the concept of degree of categoricity.

We propose to study degrees of isomorphism in the context of the new intersection of computable structure theory and computable analysis; specifically with regard to computable copies of $\ell^p$. So, whenever $\mathcal{B}$ is a computable Banach space that is linearly isometric to $\ell^p$, we define the isometry degree of $\mathcal{B}$ to be the least powerful Turing degree that computes a linear isometry of $\ell^p$ onto $\mathcal{B}$.

It is not obvious that degrees of isomorphism always exist. e.g. R. Miller has produced a computable structure with no degree of computable categoricity [11]. We are thus pleasantly surprised to find that computable copies of $\ell^p$ always have an isometry degree and that we can say precisely what these degrees are. Specifically, we prove the following two theorems.

**Theorem 1.1.** *When $p$ is a computable real so that $p \geq 1$, every computable copy of $\ell^p$ has a degree of isometry, and this degree is c.e..*

**Theorem 1.2.** *When $p$ is a computable real so that $p \geq 1$ and $p \neq 2$, the isometry degrees of the computable copies of $\ell^p$ are precisely the c.e. degrees.*

One direction of Theorem 1.2 is already known; namely that every c.e. degree is an isometry degree [8]. However, we give a new proof which is simpler and more intuitive.

The *computable dimension* of a structure is the number of its computable copies up to computable isomorphism. Since there exists a countable family of pairwise Turing incomparable c.e. sets we obtain the following.

**Corollary 1.3.** *If $p$ is a computable real so that $p \geq 1$ and $p \neq 2$, then the computable dimension of $\ell^p$ is $\aleph_0$.*

Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 are proven using a blend of standard concepts from computability theory, such as enumeration reducibility and right-c.e. reals, and results on isometries of $\ell^p$ spaces.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 covers background and preliminaries from functional analysis and computable analysis. Section 3 contains a required result on the complexity of uniformly right-c.e. sequences of reals. Section 4 contains the new proof that every c.e. degree is a degree of linear isometry. In Section 5 we show that every computable copy of $\ell^p$ has a degree of linear isometry and that when $p \neq 2$ this degree is c.e..

## 2. Background and preliminaries

2.1. **Background and preliminaries from functional analysis.** Let $\mathbb{C}$ denote the complex plane. When $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and $r > 0$, let $D(z; r)$ denote the open disk with center $z$ and radius $r$. *Throughout this paper, all Banach spaces are Banach spaces over the field of complex numbers.*

Let $\mathcal{B} = (V, \cdot, +, \| \|)$ be a Banach space. By a *subspace* of $\mathcal{B}$ we will always mean a linear subspace of $\mathcal{B}$ that is topologically closed. If $S \subseteq V$ and $K \subseteq \mathbb{C}$, then the *linear span of $S$ over $K$* is

$$\left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{M} \alpha_j v_j \, : \, \alpha_0, \ldots \alpha_M \in F \wedge v_0, \ldots, v_M \in S \right\}.$$

We denote this by $\mathcal{L}_K(S)$. The *subspace generated by $S \subseteq V$* is the closure of the linear span of $S$. We say that $G \subseteq V$ is a *generating set for $\mathcal{B}$* if its linear span is dense in $\mathcal{B}$.

A map $T$ between two Banach spaces is *linear* if it preserves scalar multiplication and vector addition; it is *isometric* if it preserves the metric induced by the norm; i.e. $\|T(u) - T(v)\| = \|u - v\|$. Thus, every isometric map is injective. A *isometry* of two Banach spaces is a surjective isometric map of one onto the other. Two Banach

spaces are *isometric* if there is an isometry of one onto the other and are *linearly isometric* if there is a linear isometric map of one onto the other. An *endomorphism* of a Banach space is a linear map of the space into itself. In general, terms such as 'isomorphism', 'isomorphic', 'endomorphism' are reserved for the linear structure of Banach spaces; when combined with 'isometric' or its variants they refer to maps the preserve both the linear and the metric structure. Note that a linear map is isometric if and only if it preserves the norm.

When $p$ is a positive number, $\ell^p$ denotes the space of all functions $f : \mathbb{N} \to \ell^p$ so that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |f(n)|^p < \infty.$$

Thus $\ell^p$ is a vector space over $\mathbb{C}$ with the usual scalar multiplication and vector addition. When $p \geq 1$, it is a Banach space under the norm defined by

$$\|f\|_p = (\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |f(n)|^p)^{1/p}.$$

$\ell^2$ is also a Hilbert space under the inner product defined by

$$\langle f, g\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f(n)\overline{g(n)}.$$

Fix $p \geq 1$. When $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, let $\chi_S$ denote the characteristic function of $S$. Let $e_j = \chi_{\{j\}}$. Thus, $E := \{e_0, e_1, \ldots\}$ is a generating set for $\ell^p$ which we refer to as the *standard generating set* for $\ell^p$.

When $f \in \ell^p$, the *support* of $f$ is the set of all $t \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $f(t) \neq 0$; we denote this set by $\text{supp}(f)$. If $f_0, f_1, \ldots$ are vectors in $\ell^p$ so that $\text{supp}(f_m) \cap \text{supp}(f_n) = \emptyset$ whenever $m \neq n$, then we say that $f_0, f_1, \ldots$ are *disjointly supported*.

When $f, g \in \ell^p$, we write $g \preceq f$ if $g(t) = f(t)$ whenever $g(t) \neq 0$; in this case, we say that $g$ is a *subvector* of $f$. Thus, $\preceq$ is a partial order of $\ell^p$. Note that the atoms in this ordering are the scalar multiples of the standard basis vectors. Note also that $g \preceq f$ if and only if the vectors $f - g$ and $g$ are disjointly supported.

If $f$ is a unit atom in $\ell^p$, let $f^* : \ell^p \to \mathbb{C}$ denote the functional so that $f^*(g)f \prec g$ for all $g \in \ell^p$. For example, if $f = e^{i\theta}e_0$, then $f^*(3, \ldots) = 3e^{-i\theta}$. Put another way, if $f = \lambda e_n$ where $|\lambda| = 1$, then $f^*(g) = \lambda^{-1}g(n)$. Maps of the form $f^*$ are called *coordinate functionals*.

We now describe a simple numerical test for disjointness of support when $p \neq 2$. Set $c_p = |4 - 2\sqrt{2}^p|^{-1}$. When $z, w \in \mathbb{C}$ let:

$$\sigma_1(z, w) = |2|z|^p + 2|w|^p - |z - w|^p - |z + w|^p|$$
$$\sigma(z, w) = c_p|\sigma_1(z, w)|$$

In 1958, J. Lamperti proved that $\sigma_1(z, w) = 0$ iff $zw = 0$ and that the sign of $2|z|^p + 2|w|^p - |z - w|^p - |z + w|^p$ depends only on $p$. In 2016, McNicholl sharpened this result as follows [7].

**Theorem 2.1.** *Suppose $p \geq 1$ and $p \neq 2$. Then,*

$$min\{|z|^p, |w|^p\} \leq \sigma(z, w)$$

*for all $z, w \in \mathbb{C}$. Furthermore, if $1 \leq p < 2$, then*

$$2|z|^p + 2|w|^p - |z - w|^p - |z + w|^p \geq 0$$

*and if $2 < p$*

$$2|z|^p + 2|w|^p - |z-w|^p - |z+w|^p \leq 0$$

Suppose $p \neq 2$. When $f, g \in \ell^p$, let $\sigma_1(f,g) = |2\|f\|^p + 2\|g\|^p - \|f-g\|^p - \|f = g\|^p|$ and let $\sigma(f,g) = c_p\sigma_1(f,g)$. So, if $f, g \in \ell^p$, by the 'furthermore' part of Theorem 2.1,

$$\sigma_1(f,g) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \sigma_1(f(t), g(t)).$$

Thus, when $f, g \in \ell^p$, $\operatorname{supp}(f) \cap \operatorname{supp}(g) = \emptyset$ if an only if $\sigma(f,g) = 0$, and $g \preceq f$ if and only if $\sigma(f-g, g) = 0$.

We now make a few observations about linear isometries of $\ell^p$. Suppose $p \neq 2$. We first note that $\sigma$ is preserved by linear isometries of $\ell^p$. Thus, every linear isometry of $\ell^p$ preserves the 'disjoint support relation'. That is, if $T : \ell^p \to \ell^p$ is a linear isometry, then $T(f)$ and $T(g)$ are disjointly supported whenever $f, g \in \ell^p$ are disjointly supported. This was first observed by S. Banach and later proven elegantly by J. Lamperti [2], [6]. This observation entails that linear isometries of $\ell^p$ also preserve the subvector relation and provides the basis for the proof of the following characterization of the surjective isometric endomorphisms of $\ell^p$.

**Theorem 2.2** (Banach-Lamperti)**.** *Suppose $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $p \neq 2$. If $T : \ell^p \to \ell^p$ is a linear isometry, then $T$ is a surjective linear isometry of $\ell^p$ if and only if there exist unimodular points $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \ldots$ and a permutation of $\mathbb{N}$ $\phi$ so that $T(e_n) = \lambda_n e_{\phi(n)}$ for all $n$.*

Note that $\{g_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a unitary basis of disjointly supported vectors if and only if there exist unimodular points $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \ldots$ and a permutation of $\mathbb{N}$ $\phi$ so that $g_n = \lambda_n e_{\phi(n)}$ for all $n$.

We note that there are an abundance of isometric endomorphisms of $\ell^2$: simply map the standard basis bijectively onto any orthonormal basis.

2.2. **Background and preliminaries from computable analysis.** We assume the reader is familiar with the central concepts of computability theory, including computable and computability enumerable sets, Turing reducibility, and enumeration reducibility. These are explained in [3]. We begin with the application of computability concepts to Banach spaces. Our approach is essentially the same as in [12].

We say that $F = \{f_0, f_1, \ldots\}$ is an *effective generating set* for a Banach space $\mathcal{B}$ if there is an algorithm that, given any $f \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{Q}(i)}(F)$ and a nonnegative integer $k$ as input computes a rational number $q$ so that $|\|f\| - q| < 2^{-k}$; less formally, the map $f \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{Q}(i)}(F) \mapsto \|f\|$ is computable. For example, $\{1, i\}$ is an effective generating set for $\mathbb{C}$, and the standard generating set of $\ell^p$ is an effective generating set for $\ell^p$. On the other hand, if $|\zeta| = 1$, then $\zeta E := \{\zeta e_0, \zeta e_1, \ldots\}$ is also an effective generating set for $\ell^p$, even if $\zeta$ is incomputable. The effective generating sets $\{1, i\}$ and $E$ are the default effective generating sets for $\mathbb{C}$ and $\ell^p$ respectively; i.e. when discussing computability on these spaces without mention of an effective generating set it is implicit that we are referring to the default generating set.

Suppose $F$ is an effective generating set for the Banach space $\mathcal{B}$. We say that a vector $g \in \mathcal{B}$ is *computable with respect to* $F$ if there is an algorithm that given any nonnegative integer $k$ as input computes a vector $f \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{Q}(i)}(F)$ so that $\|g - f\| < 2^{-k}$. A point $z \in \mathbb{C}$ is *computable* if it is computable with respect to $\{1, i\}$; that is if there is an algorithm that given any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ as input, produces a rational point $q$

so that $|q - z| < 2^{-k}$. A vector $f \in \ell^p$ is computable with respect to the standard generating set if there is an algorithm that given any $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ as input computes a rational point $q$ so that $|q - f(n)| < 2^{-k}$. On the other hand, if $\zeta$ is an incomputable unimodular point, then only the zero vector is computable with respect to both $E$ and $\zeta E$.

Suppose $\mathcal{B}$ is a Banach space. When $f \in \mathcal{B}$, and $r > 0$, let $B(f; r)$ denote the open ball with center $f$ and radius $r$. Suppose $F$ is an effective generating set for $\mathcal{B}$. When $f \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{Q}(i)}(F)$ and $r$ is a positive rational number, we call $B(f; r)$ a *rational ball* (with respect to $F$).

Suppose that for each $j \in \{1, 2\}$, $F_j$ is an effective generating set for $\mathcal{B}_j$. We say that a map $T :\subseteq \mathcal{B}_1 \to B_2$ is *computable with respect to* $(F_1, F_2)$ if there is an algorithm $P$ that meets the following three criteria.

(1) **Approximation:** Given as input a rational ball with respect to $F_1$, $P$ either does not halt or produces a rational ball with respect to $F_2$.
(2) **Correctness:** If $B_2$ is the output of $P$ on input $B_1$, then $T(f) \in B_2$ whenever $f \in B_1 \cap \mathrm{dom}(T)$.
(3) **Convergence:** If $V$ is a neighborhood of $T(f)$, and if $U$ is a neighborhood of $f$, then $f$ belongs to a rational ball $B_1 \subseteq U$ with the property that $P$ halts on $B_1$ and produces a rational ball that is included in $U$.

When we speak of an algorithm accepting a rational ball $B(\sum_{j=0}^{M} \alpha_j f_j; r)$ as input, we mean that it accepts some representation of the ball such as a code of the sequence $(r, M, \alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_M)$ and similarly when we say it produces a rational ball as output we mean that it produces codes of the center and radius.

It is well-known that many familiar functions of a complex variable (such as sin, exp) are computable (with respect to the generating set $\{1, i\}$ used in the domain and range). Note also that when $|\zeta| = 1$ the 'multiplication by $\zeta$' operator on $\ell^p$ is computable with respect to $E$ and $\zeta E$.

A *computable Banach space* consists of a pair $(\mathcal{B}, F)$ where $\mathcal{B}$ is a Banach space and $F$ is an effective generating set for $\mathcal{B}$. Unless the effective generating set truly requires explicit mention, for the sake of economy of expression we will just refer to 'the computable Banach space $\mathcal{B}$'.

If $(\mathcal{B}_1, F_1)$ and $(\mathcal{B}_2, F_2)$ are computable Banach spaces, then we say a map $T : \mathcal{B}_1 \to \mathcal{B}_2$ is computable if it is computable with respect to $(F_1, F_2)$. It easily follows that if $T : \mathcal{B}_1 \to \mathcal{B}_2$ is a computable linear isometry, then $T^{-1}$ is also computable.

If $(\mathcal{B}_1, F_1)$ and $(\mathcal{B}_2, F_2)$ are computable Banach spaces, then $(\mathcal{B}_1 \times \mathcal{B}_2, F_1 \times F_2)$ is a computable Banach space. Thus, if $\mathcal{B}$ is a computable Banach space, then vector addition is a computable map from $\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B}$ onto $\mathcal{B}$ and scalar multiplication is a computable map from $\mathbb{C} \times \mathcal{B}$ onto $\mathcal{B}$. In addition the norm of $\mathcal{B}$ is a computable map from $\mathcal{B}$ into $[0, \infty)$.

Let us now make precise some of the notions alluded to in the introduction; namely the adaptation of notions from computable structure theory to the setting of Banach spaces. To begin, a computable Banach space $\mathcal{B}$ is *computably categorical* if it is the case that whenever $\mathcal{B}'$ is a computable Banach space that is linearly isometric to $\mathcal{B}$, there is a computable linear isometry of $\mathcal{B}$ onto $\mathcal{B}'$. In general, any notion from the classical theory of computable structures is adapted to the context of Banach spaces by substituting 'linear isometry' for 'isomorphism'.

Suppose $(\mathcal{B}_1, F_1)$ and $(\mathcal{B}_2, F_2)$ are computable Banach spaces and $T$ is a linear isometry of $\mathcal{B}_1$ onto $\mathcal{B}_2$. Then, $F_2' = T[F_1]$ is an effective generating set for $\mathcal{B}_2$.

The map $T$ is computable if and only if the identity map on $\mathcal{B}_2$ is computable with respect to $(F_2, F_2')$. Thus, questions about the computable categoricity of a computable Banach space can be reduced to consideration of different effective generating sets on the Banach space. In addition, the computable categoricity of a computable Banach space $(\mathcal{B}, F)$ is a property solely of the underlying space $\mathcal{B}$ and is determined by its classical mathematical features.

Finally, we will need the following proposition about the computability of coordinate funtionals.

**Proposition 2.3.** *Suppose $p$ is a computable real so that $p \geq 1$, and let $F$ be an effective generating set for $\ell^p$. If $f$ is a unit atom of $\ell^p$ that is computable with respect to $F$, then $f^*$ is computable with respect to $F$.*

*Proof.* If $p = 2$, then $f^*(g) =< g, f >$. Since $\| \ \|$ is computable with respect to $F$, it follows from the polar identity that the inner product is computable with respect to $F$. So, the only challenging case is when $p \neq 2$.

Suppose $p \neq 2$. Let $\mathcal{E} = \{g \in \ell^p \ : \ \sigma(g, f) > 0\}$. If $g \in \mathcal{E}$, then $f^*(g)$ is the unique scalar $\alpha$ so that $|\alpha| \leq \|g\|_p$ and $\sigma(g, g - \alpha f) = 0$. It is well-known that when a continuous function $h$ has a unique zero on a closed disk whose center and radius are computable, this zero can be computed uniformly from $h$ (see e.g. Section 6.3 of [13] or [14]). It follows that $f^*$ is computable *on* $\mathcal{E}$; fix an algorithm $P_1$ for doing so. Fix an algorithm $P_2$ for computing $g \mapsto \sigma(g, f)$.

Given a rational ball $B_1$ as input, we first compute via $P_2$ a rational interval $I$ so that $\sigma(g, f) \in I$ for all $g \in B_1$. If $0 \notin I$, then compute via $P_1$ a rational disk $D$ so that $f^*(g) \in D$ and output $D$. Suppose $0 \in I$. If $1 \notin I$, then compute the largest $k$ so that $2^{-kp} \notin I$, and output $D(0; 2^{-k})$. If $1 \in I$, then do not halt.

We now verify the correctness of this procedure. If $0 \notin I$, then this follows from the correctness of $P_1$. Suppose $0 \in I$ and $1 \notin I$. Then, $\sigma(g, f) < 2^{-k}$ for all $g \in B_1$. Now, $f$ has the form $\lambda e_{n_0}$ for some unimodular $\lambda$ and nonnegative integer $n_0$. Thus, by definition of $f^*$, $f^*(g) = \lambda^{-1} g(n_0)$. It follows from Theorem 2.1 that $\sigma(g, f) \geq |g(n_0)|^p$. Thus, $|f^*(g)| < 2^{-k}$.

We now verify that the convergence criterion is met. Let $V$ be a neighborhood of $f^*(g)$ and let $U$ be a neighborhood of $g$. Suppose $f$ and $g$ are disjointly supported. Thus, $\sigma(f, g) = 0$ and $f^*(g) = 0$. Choose $k_1$ so that $D(0; 2^{-k_1}) \subseteq V$. Then, $g$ belongs to a rational ball $B_1 \subseteq U$ with the property that when it is provided to $P_2$ as input, $P_2$ produces an interval $I$ whose diameter is smaller than $2^{-k_1}$. It follows that when this ball is given to our procedure as input, the output disk is included in $V$.

So, suppose $f$ and $g$ are not disjointly supported (and so $\sigma(g, f) > 0$). Then, $g$ belongs to a rational ball $B' \subseteq U$ so that $P_2$ outputs an interval that omits 0 whenever it is given any rational ball that is included in $B'$ as input. Since $P_1$ satisfies the convergence criterion, $g$ belongs to a rational ball $B_1 \subseteq B'$ with the property that when it is provided to $P_1$ as input, $P_1$ outputs a rational ball included in $V$. Thus, the convergence criterion is satisfied in this case as well. □

## 3. Interval sets of reals

The proof of Theorem 1.2 requires us to confront a certain difficulty which we describe now. When $r$ is a real, the *interval set of* $r$ is the set of all open rational intervals that contain $r$, and the *Turing degree of* $r$ is the Turing degree of its

interval set. Denote the interval set of $r$ by $\mathcal{I}(r)$. A real $r$ is *right (left)-c.e.* if its right (left) Dedekind cut is c.e.. It is well known that the Turing degree of a right-c.e. real $r$ is c.e.: if $r$ is rational then its Turing degree is the Turing degree of the computable sets, and if $r$ is irrational then its degree is the degree of its right Dedekind cut. We note that this argument is not uniform. Now, suppose $\{r_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a uniformly right-c.e. sequence of nonnegative reals (i.e. the right Dedekind cut of $r_n$ is c.e. uniformly in $n$). Consider $\oplus_{n=0}^{\infty}\mathcal{I}(r_n)$. Since each $\mathcal{I}(r_n)$ has c.e. degree, we would expect this set to have c.e. degree. However, since the degree of $\mathcal{I}(r_n)$ may not be c.e. *uniformly* in $n$, it is not obvious that this is true. What we show is that, by means of enumeration reducibility, we can compress the information in the join of these interval sets into the interval set of a single right-c.e. real. Specifically, we prove the following.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Suppose $\{r_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a uniformly right-c.e. sequence of nonnegative reals. Then, there is a right-c.e. real $r$ so that the interval set of $r$ is enumeration-equivalent to the join of the interval sets of $r_0, r_1, \ldots$.*

A key tool in our proof of Theorem 3.1 is the following.

**Definition 3.2.** Suppose $\{r_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of real numbers. A *modulus of summability* for $\{r_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a function $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ so that $\left|\sum_{n=f(k)}^{\infty} r_n\right| < 2^{-k}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Thus, a sequence of reals has a modulus of summability if and only if it is summable. Suppose $\{r_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of reals for which there is a computable modulus of summability. Then, by a standard argument, the interval set of $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r_n$ is enumeration-reducible to the join of the interval sets of $r_0, r_1, \ldots$. Our proof of Theorem 3.1 is based on the following.

**Theorem 3.3.** *Suppose $\{r_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a uniformly right-c.e. or uniformly left-c.e. sequence of reals, and suppose $\{r_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ has a computable modulus of summability. Then, the interval set of $\sum_n r_n$ is enumeration-equivalent to the join of the interval sets of $r_0, r_1, \ldots$.*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, suppose $\{r_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is uniformly left-c.e.. Set $r = \sum_n r_n$. Let $f$ be a computable modulus of summability for $\{r_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$. It suffices to show that the interval set for $r_n$ is enumeration-reducible to the interval set for $r$ uniformly in $n$. Without loss of generality, suppose $n = 0$.

Suppose $I$ is an open rational interval. We claim that $r_0 \in I$ if and only if there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a, b, q_0, \ldots, q_{f(k)} \in \mathbb{Q}$ that meet the following conditions.

- $r \in (a, b)$,
- $q_j < r_j$ for all $j$,
- $I \supseteq (a - (\sum_{1\leq j\leq f(k)} q_j - 2^{-k}), 2b - (\sum_{1\leq j\leq f(k)} q_j - 2^{-k}) - a)$
- $\sum_{j\leq f(k)} q_j - 2^{-k} \in (a, b)$.

For, suppose such $k, a, b, q_0, \ldots, q_{f(k)}$ exist. Set $q = \sum_{1\leq j\leq f(k)} q_j - 2^{-k}$. Thus, $I \supseteq ((b - q) - (b - a), (b - q) + (b - a))$ and $q < \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r_n$. Therefore, $b - q >$

$r - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r_n = r_0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} |r_0 - (b-q)| &= b - q - r_0 \\ &< b - (\sum_{j \leq f(k)} q_j - 2^{-k}) \\ &< b - a. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $r_0 \in I$.

Conversely, suppose $r_0 \in I$. Choose $\epsilon > 0$ so that $(r_0 - \epsilon, r_0 + \epsilon) \subseteq I$. The interval set of $r$ contains an interval $(a, b)$ so that $b - a < \epsilon/2$. There exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $q_0, \ldots, q_{f(k)} \in \mathbb{Q}$ so that $q_j < r_j$ for all $j$ and so that

$$\sum_{j \leq f(k)} q_j - 2^{-k} \in (a, b).$$

Set $q = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq f(k)} q_j - 2^{-k}$. It again follows that $r_0 \in ((b-q)-(b-a), (b-q)+(b-a))$. Therefore, if $x \in ((b-q)-(b-a), (b-q)+(b-a))$, then $|x - r_0| < 2(b-a) < \epsilon$. Therefore, $I \supseteq ((b-q)-(b-a), (b-q)+(b-a))$.

The last three of the above conditions are $\Sigma_1^0$. It follows that the interval set of $r_0$ is enumeration-reducible to the interval set of $r$. □

*Proof Theorem 3.1:* Compute rational $s_n > r_n$ for each $n$. Set $r'_n = 2^{-n} s_n^{-1} r_n$. Thus, $f(k) = k + 1$ defines a computable modulus of summability for $\{r'_n\}_n$. Thus, the interval set of $\sum_n r'_n$ is enumeration equivalent to the join of the intervals sets of $r'_0, r'_1, \ldots$. But, the interval set of $r'_n$ is enumeration-equivalent to the interval set of $r_n$ uniformly in $n$. □

## 4. Every c.e. degree is a degree of linear isometry

Suppose $p$ is a computable real so that $p \geq 1$ and so that $p \neq 2$. Let $C$ be an infinite c.e. set. Let $\{c_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a one-to-one effective enumeration of $C$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ define the vectors

$$\begin{aligned} g_n &= e_{2n} + e_{2n+1} \\ h_{n,0} &= e_{2n} \\ h_{n,1} &= e_{2n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ define the vectors

$$\begin{aligned} f_{3n} &= g_n \\ f_{3n+1} &= h_{c_n,0} \\ f_{3n+2} &= h_{c_n,1}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $F = \{f_0, f_1, \ldots\}$, and define $\mathcal{B}$ to be the subspace generated by $F$. Since $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is computable with respect to the standard generating set, it follows that $F$ is an effective generating set for $\mathcal{B}$.

We will show that the isometry degree of $\mathcal{B}$ is the Turing degree of $C$. We start by defining another generating set for $\mathcal{B}$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, set

$$G_n = \begin{cases} \{g_n\} & \text{if } n \notin C \\ \{h_{n,0}, h_{n,1}\} & \text{if } n \in C \end{cases}$$

Let $G = \cup_{n=0}^{\infty} G_n$. Since $F$ is included in the linear span of $G$, it follows that $G$ is a generating set for $\mathcal{B}$. By definition, the elements of $G$ are disjointly supported. Note that $G$ may not be an effective generating set.

We now claim that with respect to $(E, F)$, $C$ computes a linear isometry of $\ell^p$ onto $\mathcal{B}$. We first note that each vector in $G$ belongs to the linear span of $E$ over $\mathbb{Q}(i)$. As such, it is computably enumerable relative to $C$. Thus, $C$ computes a one-to-one enumeration $\{\varphi_n\}_n$ of $G$ with respect to $F$. For every $n$, define $T(e_n) = \|\varphi_n\|^{-1}\varphi_n$. By taking the linear extension of $T$ to all of $\ell^p$ we obtain a surjective isometric endomorphism which we also denote by $T$, and $C$ computes $T$ with respect to $(E, F)$.

We now claim that if, with respect to $(E, F)$, $X$ computes a linear isometry of $\ell^p$ onto $\mathcal{B}$, then $X$ computes $C$. For, suppose $X$ computes such a map $T$. Then, $X$ computes the sequence $\{T(e_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with respect to $F$. Note that, as discussed in Section 2, each $T(e_n)$ is an atom of $(\mathcal{B}, \preceq)$. It follows that for each $n$, there exists a unimodular $\lambda$ so that either $T(e_n) = \lambda e_k$ where $\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor \in C$ or $T(e_n) = \frac{\lambda}{2^{1/p}}(e_{2k} + e_{2k+1})$ where $k \notin C$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows from the construction of $F$ that $X$ computes $\{j \in \mathbb{N} \,:\, T(e_j)(k) \neq 0\}$ uniformly in $k$. So, given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ as input, compute via oracle $X$ the unique $j$ so that $T(e_j)(2n) \neq 0$. Then, via oracle $X$, determine if $T(e_j)(2n+1) = 0$. If $T(e_j)(2n+1) = 0$, then $n \in C$; otherwise $n \notin C$.

## 5. Every computable copy of $\ell^p$ has a c.e. degree of linear isometry

Throughout this section, $p$ is a computable real so that $p \geq 1$ and $p \neq 2$, and $F = \{f_0, f_1, \ldots\}$ is an effective generating set for $\ell^p$.

Our proof of Theorem 1.1 is based on maps $\phi :\subseteq \omega^{<\omega} \to \ell^p$ that are order-preserving in the sense that

$$\rho \subset \tau \;\Rightarrow\; \phi(\tau) \prec \phi(\rho).$$

Such a map *locally preserves meets at* $\rho$ if

$$\phi(\rho) = \sum_{\rho^\frown(j)\in \mathrm{dom}(\phi)} \phi(\rho^\frown(j)).$$

In this case the map also has the property that it maps incomparable nodes to disjointly supported vectors.

A map from a subtree of $\omega^{<\omega}$ into $\ell^p - \{0\}$ is *disintegrating* if it is order-preserving and locally preserves meets, and if its range is a generating set for $\ell^p$.

When we say a map $\phi :\subseteq \omega^{<\omega} \to \ell^p$ is computable with respect to $F$ we mean that there is an algorithm that given a node $\nu \in \mathrm{dom}(\phi)$ and a nonnegative integer $k$ produces a vector $f \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{Q}(i)}(F)$ so that $\|f - \phi(\nu)\|_p < 2^{-k}$. It is essentially proven in [7] that there is a disintegrating map that is computable with respect to $F$; fix such a map $\phi$ and let $\mathcal{T} = \mathrm{dom}(\phi)$.

When $\tau$ is a non-root node of $\omega^{<\omega}$, let $\tau^-$ denote its parent. A non-root $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ is an *almost norm-maximizing child of* $\tau^-$ if $\max_{\tau'} \|\phi(\tau')\|_p^p \leq \|\phi(\tau^-)\|_p^p + 2^{-(|\tau|+1)}$ where $\tau'$ ranges over all children of $\tau$ in $\mathcal{T}$. A chain $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ is *almost norm-maximizing* if for each non-terminal $\sigma \in \mathcal{C}$, $\mathcal{C}$ contains an almost norm-maximizing child of $\sigma$.

In [7], it is shown that if $\mathcal{C}$ is an almost norm-maximizing chain, then the $\preceq$-infimum of $\phi[C]$ is either $\mathbf{0}$ or an atom. It is also shown that there is a computable partition of $\mathcal{T}$ into almost norm-maximizing chains $\mathcal{C}_0, \mathcal{C}_1, \ldots$ and that $\{\inf \phi[\mathcal{C}_0], \inf \phi[\mathcal{C}_1], \ldots\}$ is a disjointly supported generating set for $\ell^p$. Set $g_n = \inf \phi[\mathcal{C}_n]$. Note that $\|g_n\|_p$ is right-c.e. uniformly in $n$.

By Theorem 3.1, Theorem 1.1 now follows from the following two lemmas. Note that an oracle $X$ computes a real $r$ if and only if it computes an enumeration of the interval set of $r$.

**Lemma 5.1.** *If $X$ computes $\|g_n\|_p$ uniformly in $n$, then $X$ computes a surjective isometric endomorphism of $\ell^p$ with respect to $(E, F)$.*

**Lemma 5.2.** *If $X$ computes a surjective isometric endomorphism of $\ell^p$ with respect to $(E, F)$, then with respect to $F$, $X$ computes $\|g_n\|_p$ uniformly in $n$.*

*Proof of Lemma 5.1.* Let $G = \{n \mid g_n \neq \mathbf{0}\}$. Since $X$ computes the interval set of $\|g_n\|_p$ uniformly in $n$, it follows that $X$ computes an enumeration of $G$. Since $\{g_0, g_1, \ldots\}$ is a generating set for $\ell^p$, $G$ is infinite. So, $X$ computes a one-to-one enumeration of $G$, $\{n_m\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$.

Let $T : \ell^p \to \ell^p$ be the unique linear map so that $T(e_m) = \|g_{n_m}\|_p^{-1} g_{n_m}$ for all $m$. It follows that $\{T(e_0), T(e_1), \ldots\}$ is a disjointly supported generating set for $\ell^p$. Thus, $T$ is isometric and surjective. Since, with respect to $F$, $X$ computes the sequence $\{T(e_m)\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$, it follows that $X$ computes $T$ with respect to $(E, F)$. □

*Proof of Lemma 5.2:* Fix an $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that with respect to $(E, F)$, $X$ computes a surjective isometric endomorphism $T$ of $\ell^p$.

Let $\kappa_n$ denote the cardinality of $\mathcal{C}_n$. When $j < \kappa_n$, set $\tau_{n,j} = (j+1)st$-element $\mathcal{C}_n$ in $\subset$-ascending order. Set $g_{n,j} = \phi(\sigma_{n,j})$, and let $k_{n,j}$ denote the length of $\tau_{n,j}$. Thus, $g_n = \lim_j g_{n,j}$.

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. We compute, with oracle $X$, a rational number $q$ so that $|q - \|g_n\|_p| < 2^{-m}$ as follows. Begin computing $T(e_0)$, $T(e_1)$, ... and $g_{n,0}, g_{n,1}, \ldots$ with respect to $F$. Note that by the uniformity of the proof of Proposition 2.3, $T(e_k)^*$ is computable with respect to $F$ uniformly in $k$. Wait for stage $s$ so that one of the following is witnessed at stage $s$:

(1) There exists $j < \kappa_n$ so that $\|g_{n,j}\|_p < 2^{-m}$.
(2) There exists $k, j$ so that $\sigma(T(e_k), g_{n,j}) > 0$,

$$\|g_{n,j} - T(e_k)^*(g_{n,j})T(e_k)\|_p^p < 2^{-(m+1)}, \text{ and}$$

$$\|g_{n,j} - T(e_k)^*(g_{n,j})T(e_k)\|_p^p + 2^{-k_{n,j}} < \|T(e_k)^*(g_{n,j})T(e_k)\|_p^p.$$

In the first case, output 0. In the second case, compute and output a rational number $q$ so that $|q - |T^*(e_k)(g_{n,j})|| < 2^{-m}$.

We first show that this search terminates for every $m$. If $g_n = \mathbf{0}$, then it is clear that there exists a $j$ such that $\|g_{n,j}\|_p < 2^{-m}$. Assume that $g_n$ is nonzero. Thus, $g_n$ is an atom. Since $T$ is a surjective isometric endomorphism, it follows from Theorem 2.2 that $\|g_n\|_p^{-1} g_n$ is a unimodular multiple of $T(e_k)$ for some $k$. Thus, $\sigma(T(e_k), g_n) > 0$ and $T(e_k)^*(g_n)T(e_k) = g_n$. It then follows that (2) holds for all sufficiently large $j$.

We now show that the rational number $q$ produced by this procedure on input $m$ satisfies $|q - \|g_n\|_p| < 2^{-m}$. This is clear if condition (1) is met. So, suppose

the procedure halts as a result of condition (2) being met via $k, j$. We show that $T(e_k)^*(g_{n,j})T(e_k) = g_n$. To do so, we show that for every $t$, $T(e_k)^*(g_{n,j})T(e_k) \prec g_{n,j+t}$. We proceed by induction on $t$. By definition of $f^*$, $T(e_k)^*(g_{n,j})T(e_k) \prec g_{n,j}$. So, let $t > 0$ and assume $T(e_k)^*(g_{n,j})T(e_k) \prec g_{n,j+t-1}$. By way of contradiction, suppose $T(e_k)^*(g_{n,j})T(e_k) \not\prec g_{n,j+t}$. Set $\rho = \tau_{j+t-1}$. Let $S = \{a \ : \ \rho^\frown(a) \in \mathcal{T}\}$. Since $\phi$ is a disintegrating map,

$$g_{n,j+t-1} = \sum_{a \in S} \phi(\rho^\frown(a)).$$

Furthermore, $\phi(\rho^\frown(a))$ and $\phi(\rho^\frown(a'))$ are disjointly supported when $a, a' \in S$ are distinct. Thus, there is a unique $a \in S$ so that $T(e_k)^*(g_{n,j})T(e_k) \preceq \phi(\rho^\frown(a))$; let $v = \phi(\rho^\frown(a))$. Since $\mathcal{C}_n$ is an almost norm-maximizing chain.

$$\|v\|_p^p \leq \|g_{n,j+t}\|_p^p + 2^{-k_{n,j+t-1}}.$$

Since $T(e_k)^*(g_{n,j})T(e_k) \prec v$,

$$\|v\|_p^p \geq \|T(e_k)^*(g_{n,j})T(e_k)\|_p^p.$$

Since $T(e_k)^*(g_{n,j})T(e_k) \not\prec g_{n,j+t}$, $g_{n,j+1} \prec g_{n,j} - T(e_k)^*(g_{n,j})T(e_k)$ and so

$$\|g_{n,j+t}\|_p^p \leq \|g_{n,j} - T(e_k)^*(g_{n,j})T(e_k)\|_p^p.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\|T(e_k)^*(g_{n,j})T(e_k)\|_p^p &\leq \|g_{n,j+t}\|_p^p + 2^{-k_{n,j+t}} \\ &\leq \|g_{n,j} - T(e_k)^*(g_{n,j})T(e_k)\|_p^p + 2^{-k_{n,j+t}} \\ &\leq \|g_{n,j} - T(e_k)^*(g_{n,j})T(e_k)\|_p^p + 2^{-k_{n,j}},\end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. Hence $T(e_k)^*(g_{n,j})T(e_k) \prec g_{n,j+t}$ for every $t \geq 0$. So $T(e_k)^*(g_{n,j})T(e_k) = g_n$, and the proof is complete. □

## 6. Conclusion

Suppose $p$ is a computable real so that $p \geq 1$ and $p \neq 2$. We have investigated the least powerful Turing degree that computes a surjective linear isometry of $\ell^p$ onto one of its computable copies. We have shown that this degree always exists, and, somewhat surprisingly, that these degrees are precisely the c.e. degrees. Thus computable analysis yields a computability-theoretic property that characterizes the c.e. degrees.

It is also possible to consider the least powerful Turing degree that computes a surjective linear isometry from one nonstandard computable copy of $\ell^p$ onto another. In a forthcoming paper by Andrews, Kuyper, McNicholl, Miller, and Soskova, it will be shown that such a degree may not exist.

The isometry degree of a pair of computable copies of $\ell^p$ is an instance of a more general notion of the isomorphism degree of an isomorphic pair of computable structures which is related to the concept of a degree of categoricity. Since there exist computable structures for which there is no degree of categoricity, this leads to the question "Is there a computable structure $\mathcal{A}$ for which there is no degree of computable categoricity but with the property that any two of its computable copies possess a degree of isomorphism?"

## Acknowledgments

We thank U. Andrews, R. Kuyper, S. Lempp, J. Miller, and M. Soskova for very helpful conversations during the first author's visit to the University of Wisconsin; in particular for suggesting the use of enumeration reducibility. This visit was funded in part by a travel grant from the Simons Foundation.

## References

[1] B. Anderson and B. Csima, *Degrees that are not degrees of categoricity*, Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic (2016).

[2] S. Banach, *Theory of linear operations*, North-Holland Mathematical Library, vol. 38, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1987, Translated from the French by F. Jellett, With comments by A. Pełczyński and Cz. Bessaga.

[3] S. Barry Cooper, *Computability theory*, Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2004.

[4] Barbara F. Csima, Johanna N. Y. Franklin, and Richard A. Shore, *Degrees of categoricity and the hyperarithmetic hierarchy*, Notre Dame J. Form. Log. **54** (2013), no. 2, 215–231.

[5] Ekaterina B. Fokina, Iskander Kalimullin, and Miller Russell, *Degrees of categoricity of computable structures*, Arch. Math. Logic **49** (2010), no. 1, 51–67.

[6] John Lamperti, *On the isometries of certain function-spaces*, Pacific J. Math. **8** (1958), 459–466.

[7] Timothy H. McNicholl, *Computable copies of $\ell^p$*, Submitted. Preprint available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1504.04664.

[8] Timothy H. McNicholl, *A note on the computable categoricity of $\ell^p$ spaces*, Evolving computability, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 9136, Springer, Cham, 2015, pp. 268–275.

[9] Alexander G. Melnikov, *Computably isometric spaces*, J. Symbolic Logic **78** (2013), no. 4, 1055–1085.

[10] Alexander G. Melnikov and Keng Meng Ng, *Computable structures and operations on the space of continuous functions*, Fundamenta Mathematicae **233** (2014), no. 2, 1 – 41.

[11] Russell Miller, *d-computable categoricity for algebraic fields*, J. Symbolic Logic **74** (2009), no. 4, 1325–1351.

[12] Marian B. Pour-El and J. Ian Richards, *Computability in analysis and physics*, Perspectives in Mathematical Logic, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989.

[13] Klaus Weihrauch, *Computable analysis*, Texts in Theoretical Computer Science. An EATCS Series, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000.

[14] M. Ziegler, *Effectively open mappings*, Journal of Complexity **22** (2006), 827–849.

Department of Mathematics, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011
*E-mail address*: mcnichol@iastate.edu

Department of Computer Science, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011
*E-mail address*: dstull@iastate.edu